

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/582,669	SHIMA, KOTARO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	VICTOR MACARTHUR	3679	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) VICTOR MACARTHUR. (3) Jesse Collier.

(2) Kevin Gualano. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 June 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: N/A.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-4.

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record and the following art not yet of record: USPNs 4690581, 2003/0180089, 4324501, 4318627, 3602560.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Victor MacArthur/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3679  
Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The applicant proposed amending the claims with functional language to overcome the prior art. The examiner reminded applicant that wherein the prior art sets forth applicant's claimed product structure any claimed functions or properties are presumed to be inherent until applicant submits ACTUAL EVIDENCE that clearly PROVES otherwise, in accordance with MPEP 2112.01 (I) and Ex parte Martin et al, decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, Patent No. 6920019, the paper filed on 11/19/2004, pages 6 and 9 (note that citation of an unpublished decision of Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is proper when it is available to the public in the patented file, in accordance with MPEP §707.06).

The examiner then presented the art noted above and suggested the following allowable terminology:

**Claim 1.** A ball joint comprising:  
a ball stud having a spherical head portion and a shaft portion; and  
a socket receiving the spherical head portion therein; and  
a ball seat having hollow spherical resin element, a first annular resin element, a second annular resin element, and a plurality of slits formed in the spherical resin element and first annular resin element;  
the spherical resin element disposed between the socket and head portion and having a top end with an opening receiving the ball stud therethrough and a bottom end supporting a bottom of the head portion, the spherical resin element allowing the ball stud to turn in relation to the socket about the spherical center of the head portion;  
the first annular resin element disposed in the top end of the spherical resin element between the spherical resin element and the spherical head portion;  
the second annular resin element disposed in the bottom end of the spherical resin element between the spherical resin element and the socket;  
the first and second annular resin elements having a higher coefficient of friction than the spherical resin element such that rotation of the ball stud causes the spherical resin element to deform a rotational direction about the center of the head portion before the spherical head portion starts sliding in the rotation direction in relation to the deformation portion of the ball seat.